



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/391,631	02/12/96	CLASSEN	CLASSEN=1A

001444 HM11/1207  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
624 NINTH STREET, NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER  
BRUMBACK, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1643	18

DATE MAILED: 12/07/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/591,651

A.

Classen

Examiner  
Brenda Brumback

Group Art Unit  
1643



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brenda Brumback (PTO), Donna Wortman (PTO)

(3) Lynette Smith (PTO)

(2) Richard Schwartz (PTO)

(4) Iver Cooper

Date of Interview Dec 1, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending method and kit claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

Art cited in rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Outstanding enablement rejections of method claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, were discussed. Outstanding rejections of kit claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) were also discussed. Included in this discussion was a discussion of the patentability of printer matter and case law regarding functionality of printed material. No consensus was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Brenda Brumback 12/1/99*

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.